

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Quinton Sentell Fowler,)	C/A No. 4:12-1900-TLW-TER
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Report and Recommendation
)	
Vincent R. Flamini;)	
Allen Rhodes;)	
Robert Drulis;)	
William Nida;)	
Bobby G. Frederick,)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Background of this Case

Plaintiff is a federal detainee at the Florence County Detention Center in Effingham, South Carolina. In *United States v. Quinton Sentell Fowler, also known as Quarter*, Criminal No. 4:11-CR-2162-TLW-1, Plaintiff on March 27, 2012, entered a plea of guilty to one count of conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base. Plaintiff is awaiting sentencing in Criminal No. 4:11-CR-2162-TLW-1. Plaintiff does not specifically list the occupations of the Defendants in the “Parties” portion of his handwritten Complaint. The allegations in the Complaint and the exhibits appended thereto, however, indicate that Vincent R. Flamini is a Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and that Allen Rhodes is an agent with Federal Drug Enforcement Task Force Administration. The docket sheet in Criminal No. 4:11-CR-2162-TLW-1 reveals that Bobby G. Frederick is Plaintiff’s court-appointed attorney in Criminal No. 4:11-CR-2162-TLW-1.

Plaintiff provides no specific information about Robert Drulis or William Nida. It appears, however, that they are local law enforcement officers for the City of Florence Police Department or the Florence County Sheriff's Department.

In the Complaint, Plaintiff challenges his arrest by local law enforcement officers on September 19, 2011. Plaintiff also alleges: (1) the investigating officers planted drugs in the apartment being searched by them and stole money from Plaintiff's girlfriend and from Plaintiff; (2) Plaintiff's federal indictment is falsified; (3) the affidavit for the search warrant "violates the statute of limitations for a drug conspiracy[;]" (4) there are obvious discrepancies in the first indictment; and (5) the superseding indictment constituted abuse of process. In his prayer for relief, Plaintiff seeks a declaratory judgment, a preliminary injunction, compensatory damages of one million dollars from each Defendant, punitive damages of one million dollars from each Defendant, a jury trial, court costs, and any other relief deemed just, proper, and equitable by this Court.

Discussion

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review* has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31–35 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324–25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 519 (1972)(*per curiam*); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951, 953–56 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); *Todd v.*

*Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 DSC, the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

Baskerville, 712 F.2d 70, 71–74 (4th Cir. 1983); *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F.2d 1291, 1295–96 (4th Cir. 1978); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). Plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 90–95 (2007)(*per curiam*); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9–10 (1980)(*per curiam*); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319, 321–23 (1972)(*per curiam*). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint or petition, a plaintiff's or petitioner's allegations are assumed to be true. *Merriweather v. Reynolds*, 586 F. Supp. 2d 548, 554 (D.S.C. 2008). Nonetheless, a litigant must plead factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant or respondent is plausibly liable, not merely possibly liable. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1951–52 (2009). Even when considered under this less stringent standard, the Complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Social Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 390–91 (4th Cir. 1990).

The undersigned is treating the above-captioned case as a Section 1983 action against Defendants Drulis and Nida and as a *Bivens* action against Defendants Flamini, Rhodes, and Frederick. In *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388, 397 (1971), the Supreme Court established a direct cause of action under the Constitution of the United States against federal officials for the violation of federal constitutional rights. “*Bivens* is the case establishing, as a general proposition, that victims of a constitutional violation perpetrated by a federal actor may sue the offender for damages in federal court despite the absence of explicit statutory authorization for such suits.” *Wright v. Park*, 5 F.3d 586, 589 n. 4 (1st Cir. 1993), which cites, *inter alia*, *Carlson v. Green*, 446 U.S. 14, 18 (1980) (restating *Bivens* rule).

A *Bivens* claim is analogous to a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983: federal officials cannot be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because they do not act under color of *state* law. See *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 814–20 & n. 30 (1982). *Harlow*, which is often cited for the principle of the qualified immunity of state officials for acts within the scope of their employment, was brought against a federal official. In footnote 30 of the opinion in *Harlow*, the Supreme Court stated that *Harlow* was applicable to state officials sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In other words, case law involving § 1983 claims is applicable in *Bivens* actions and *vice versa*. See *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 255 n. 2 (2006); and *Starling v. United States*, 664 F. Supp. 2d 558, 561 (D.S.C. 2009) (“*Bivens* allows an action against federal employees for violations of constitutionally protected rights. A *Bivens* action is the federal analog to a claim brought against state officials under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.”).

Plaintiff’s allegations relating to a claim of false arrest fail because the original indictment of September 27, 2011, and the superseding indictment of December 13, 2011, in Criminal No. 4:11-CR-2162-TLW-1 establish probable cause for Plaintiff’s arrest. See *Gatter v. Zappile*, 67 F. Supp. 2d 515, 519 (E.D. Pa. 1999) (collecting cases holding that a grand jury indictment is affirmative evidence of probable cause), *aff’d*, 225 F.3d 648 (3d Cir. 2000), and *Sibdhannie v. Coffey*, No. CIV. A. 06-3394(PGS), 2006 WL 3780778, at *3 (D.N.J. Dec. 21, 2006) (“A grand jury indictment is affirmative evidence of probable cause sufficient to defeat claims for malicious prosecution and false arrest under § 1983.”), which are cited in *Provet v. South Carolina*, Civil Action No. 6:07-1094-GRA-WMC, 2007 WL 1847849, at *5 (D.S.C. June 25, 2007).

Plaintiff's claims relating to his arrest, indictments, and federal criminal case are subject to summary dismissal because this case is subject to summary dismissal because a right of action has not accrued. *See Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994):

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such a determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. at 486–87 (footnote omitted).

The holding in *Heck v. Humphrey* is applicable to *Bivens* actions. *See Rice v. Nat'l Sec. Council*, 244 F.Supp.2d 594, 601 (D.S.C. 2001) (“*Heck v. Humphrey* is applicable in civil suits, such as *Bivens* actions, against federal officials and entities.”), which quotes *Williams v. Hill*, 878 F. Supp. 269, 272 (D.D.C. 1995) (“Because Plaintiff has not established that the validity of his conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, or impugned by the granting of a § 2255 motion or a writ of habeas corpus under § 2241, his *Bivens* action challenging his conviction and sentence will be DISMISSED as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d).”), *aff'd*, 74 F.3d 1339 (D.C. Cir. 1996).

Plaintiff's court-appointed attorney, Mr. Frederick, is entitled to summary dismissal because he has not acted under color of state law or under color of federal law with respect to his

representation of Plaintiff. *See Am. Mfr. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan*, 526 U.S. 40, 50–52 (1999); *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980); and *Hall v. Quillen*, 631 F.2d 1154, 1155–56 & nn. 2-3 (4th Cir. 1980).

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without service of process. Plaintiff’s attention is directed to the Notice on the next page.

July 11, 2012
Florence, South Carolina

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

Plaintiff is advised that he may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. **Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk of Court
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).